

REMARKS

Claims 14-26 are pending and Claims 14-24 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Claim 25 is objected to. Claims 14 and 16 are amended herein. Claims 14-26 remain for consideration.

Support for amended Claims 14 and 16 is found in the original disclosure, for example, in the Substitute Specification, at least at paragraphs [0010] and [0022] and FIG. 1. Thus, no new matter is added.

The Examiner objects to Claim 25 but states that Claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for identifying the allowable subject matter.

Claims 14-24 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,210,276 to Lapshev et al (hereinafter “Lapshev”). This rejection is respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

Unlike the invention recited in amended Claim 14, Lapshev fails to disclose that the “centrifugal rotor has a rotatable central shaft, which is rotatable with the rotor.” Instead, Lapshev states that the “centrifugal fluid cleaner consists of a vertical hollow shaft fixed rigidly to a base,” *Lapshev Abstract and column 2, lines 5-7* and the “centrifugal fluid cleaner is attached to a stationary base 5 through the medium of a flange 4 secured to the hollow shaft 1 which, in turn, carries a cylindrical rotor 8 adapted to revolve in suitable bearings 6 and 7 so as to impart a gyratory movement to the fluid.” *Lapshev at column 2, line 67 to column 3 line 4*. A shaft fixed to the base with a rotor revolving there around is not a centrifugal rotor which has a rotatable central shaft, which is rotatable with the rotor, as recited in amended Claim 14.

In addition, unlike amended Claim 14, Lapshev does not disclose an apparatus for cleaning gas from particles suspended therein comprising: a centrifugal rotor for rotation of the gas. Instead, Lapshev is directed to cleaning liquid fluid such as oil, fuel, and detergent liquids. *Lapshev at column 1, lines 5-11*. It is further evident that Lapshev is directed to liquid fluids because Lapshev’s centrifugal cleaner requires priming and that air be bled out prior to starting. *Lapshev at column 1, lines 46-52*. Neither priming nor bleeding of air is applicable to centrifugal gas cleaners. Moreover, Lapshev fails to include any indication that the general term fluid includes gases.

Furthermore, Lapshev fails to disclose “a channel in which a mist of lubricant is movable from a space near the centrifugal rotor into contact with one of the bearings,” as recited in amended Claim 14. Instead, Lapshev discloses that the bearings 6, 7 and 23 are lubricated with a “purified fluid,” which as discussed above is not a gas and therefore cannot be a mist of lubricant. *Lapshev at column 4, lines 40-43.* One important aspect of the present invention is that the mist of lubricant could be provided in a space near the centrifugal rotor in several different ways including: 1) without a separate connection outside the rotor and 2) by a pressurized oil causing rotation of the rotor. *Substitute Specification at paragraphs [0005] to [0007].*

Because Lapshev fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, *inter alia*, that a “centrifugal rotor has a rotatable central shaft, which is rotatable with the rotor,” as now recited in Claim 14, Claim 14 is not anticipated by Lapshev. For at least this reason, Claim 14 is allowable over Lapshev. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the § 102 rejection of Claim 14.

Since Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 14, as now written, is patentable over Lapshev and Claims 2-26 depend directly or indirectly from and further limit independent Claim 14, Claims 2-26 are also patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-24 and 26 and the objection of Claim 25.

Applicants believe that the foregoing remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein are allowable. An early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants’ representative at the phone number listed below.

No fee is believed due with the filing of this Amendment and Reply. However, if a fee is due, Applicants authorize the payment of any additional charges that may be necessary to maintain the pendency of the present application to the undersigned attorney's Deposit Account No. 503342.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Richard R. Michaud/
Richard R. Michaud
Registration No. 40,088
Attorney for Applicants

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP
306 Industrial Park Road, Suite 206
Middletown, CT 06457-1532
(860) 632-7200